

21/10/04 Yaron Mayer

22/23

Appl. No. 10/615,981

Amdt. dated Oct. 21, 2004

Reply to Office action of May 21, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Regarding clause 1 of your examination report, I can prepare an IDS based on the list of references that has been included in the specification. However, I would like to point out that the review of these references in the specification is clearly more informative than just listing them again on a separate paper, so apart from the formalities, I see no reason why you should ignore them in the meantime and I would appreciate it very much if you would consider them from the specification.
2. Regarding clause 2 of your examination report (drawings), I have corrected in Fig. 1d and in the reference to Fig. 1d, the characters "11a & 11b" to "11d & 11e". The reference sign that shows as '7' in Fig. 7f was indeed '76' but the '6' did not show on the printing because of being at the right edge of the page. I have therefore moved the number 76 to the left so that the 6 will also show on the printing. I have added the reference to signs 23a-24b to the reference to Fig. 2. I have also added the reference to signs 51a & 51b to the reference to Fig. 5a. I have also corrected the reference sign a44 in Figs. 4, 4b and 4c to 44a.
3. Regarding clause 3 of your examination report, I have amended the grammatical and spelling errors that were indicated accordingly, and also additional similar errors which I found. Similar corrections were also made in the claims. I have also divided paragraphs in the specification that were too long into smaller paragraphs.
4. Regarding clause 5 of your examination report, I respectfully disagree that "the bulk of the claim language is stated in negative terms", since the only 2 claims that contain a few limitations based on negative limitations are independent claims 1 & 12. I have reduced the number of negative terms in these claims, and I have added to these claims the structure which goes up to make the device and added positive specification. In addition, I would like to point out that since it is well known in the art how a normal printer operates, the important thing in

21/10/04 Yaron Mayer

23/23

this particular case is to explain clearly the new elements claimed in the present invention and not structural features of normal printers which are already well known in the art. I have also changed all the "." to ";" at the end of each internal clause within the claims, as required. I have also corrected indefinite terms in the claims.

5. Regarding the indication that there might be a basis after these corrections for an election of species, I would like to point out that since there are only two independent claims (one of them a system claim and one of them a method claim) there should be no problem of unity of invention, and I respectfully request that such election will not be required.
6. I apologize for the errors, but I hope that you will agree that this application contains a large number of significant improvements over the prior art.

Respectfully submitted,

Yaron Mayer

